



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/050,517

01/18/2002

Andrea Manganini

Q68141

7765

23373 7590 06/11/2007  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

SEFCHECK, GREGORY B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/11/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/050,517	MANGANINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory B. Sefcheck	2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory B. Sefcheck, Examiner of Record. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Diallo Crenshaw, Applicant's Representative. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 30 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: de Boer (USP 6,616,350) and Takeguchi (USP 6,735,171).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Purpose of the interview was to discuss differences between the claims and the prior art used in the claim rejections in the Office Action filed 3-6-2007. The Examiner explained the position of how de Boer and Takeguchi are combined to meet the claim limitation of "additional pair of bytes being used for indicating the requests of span protections of at least two different types for at least two different spans at the same time of a request of ring protection". Mr. Crenshaw believes the specificity of this claim limitation overcomes the rejection while the Examiner maintains the rejections are reasonable and supported based upon the cited disclosures of de Boer and Takeguchi. A response to the pending Office Action will attempt to further overcome the rejections through amendment and/or argument.